



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,264	09/28/2001	Elizabeth K. Barber	896034605001	4008
7590	02/13/2004		EXAMINER	
Barbara E. Arndt, Ph. D. Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue North Point 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114				KAUSHAL, SUMESH
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				1636
DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/966,264	BARBER, ELIZABETH K.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D.	1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2002.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) 1-40 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . . . .  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, 16-18 and 22-23, 37-38 drawn to polynucleotides sequences, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- II. Claim 15, drawn to an antisense RNA molecule, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- III. Claims 19-21 and 24-31 and 37, drawn to polypeptide sequences, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- IV. Claims 32-33, drawn to antibodies, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
- V. Claims 34, drawn to a method of screening leukemic cells by detecting nucleic acid sequences, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- VI. Claims 34-36, drawn to a method of screening leukemic cells by detecting the presence of a protein or polypeptide by an antibody, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- VII. Claims 39-40, drawn to a method for gene therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 44.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, III and IV are distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case nucleic acid molecules, antisense RNA molecules, proteins, and antibodies are structurally and functionally distinct product. For example, proteins and antibodies are biologically active compounds wherein the nucleic acids require an expression vector to express the encoded product. Furthermore an antisense RNA molecule is distinct from a nucleic acid sequence, since the antisense RNA does not

encode a protein but inhibits protein translation. Thus these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions I, V and VII are related as product and process of use, which are further distinct from the invention of group VI. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid of invention I could also be used to make recombinant proteins, besides a method for gene therapy or nucleic acid detection. Furthermore the method for gene therapy is distinct from the method of DNA detection, since these methods employ different material and method (see (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). For example a method for gene therapy requires in-vivo transduction of host cells using an expression vector, whereas the method of detecting DNA employs a PCR reaction or a hybridization protocol. In addition the polynucleotides of group I is not required for the invention of group VI, since invention of group VI requires the detection of protein using antibodies which have different structure and function as compared to nucleic acid molecules. Thus these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions II and V, VI, VII are distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antisense RNA molecule (group II) is not required for method of screening leukemic cells by detecting nucleic acid sequences or by antibodies. In addition the method of gene therapy requires the nucleic acid molecules of SEQ ID NO: 1 which would increase the amount of protein encoded by SEQ ID NO:1, whereas the antisense RNA molecule of invention II would down regulate the expression of a protein encoded by the nucleic acid sequences of SEQ ID NO:1. Thus these inventions are independent and distinct, which have separate uses.

Inventions III and V, VI, VII are distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different

modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polypeptide sequence of group III is not required for is not required for method of screening leukemic cells by detecting nucleic acid sequences or by antibodies. In addition a gene-based therapy is distinct from a polypeptide treatment since polypeptides are active compounds where as gene-therapy requires the transduction of a host cell with expression vectors in order to express the protein of interest. Thus these inventions are independent and distinct, which have separate uses.

Inventions IV and V, VII are distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). A method detecting a nucleic acid sequence and a method of gene therapy have different modes of operation, functions, and effects and do not require the use of an antibody. Thus these inventions are independent and distinct, which have separate uses.

Inventions IV and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibodies of invention IV could also be used to make affinity columns for protein purification besides detecting the corresponding proteins with labeled antibodies. Thus these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions V and VI are distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case method of detecting a nucleic acid using a DNA probe requires a hybridization procedure, which is structurally and functionally and distinct from antigen-antibody reaction. Thus these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply

where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. from 9AM-5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yucel Irem Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sumesh Kaushal  
Examiner Art Unit 1636

*Gerry Leffers*  
**GERRY LEFFERS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**